

We must broaden our focus because the jihad has no borders, and thus our security policy must have no borders. James Traub recently likened jihadism to Communism without Russia, explaining that “its success or failure is measured in ideological rather than territorial terms.” That is the threat we face, a threat based not on borders but on beliefs.

Which brings us back to our initial question: how can we best keep Americans safe from an ideological and borderless threat? We have sunk billions of dollars into Afghanistan, but at some point we must prioritize our spending. The reality is we have limited resources, measured both in lives and tax dollars, and we must expend those resources carefully and pragmatically.

“The problems of this world are deeper, more involved, and more stubborn than many of us realize,” said George Keenan, scholar and diplomat, in a 1949 speech to the Academy of Political Science. “It is imperative,” he continued “that we economize with our limited resources and that we apply them where we feel that we will do the most good.”

If pouring a large portion of our precious resources into Afghanistan will keep Americans safe from another terrorist attack, then it is an unquestionable investment we must make. But the reality that we are battling a worldwide network of jihadists might require us to step back and reassess our priorities.

If we are ever to achieve our objective of keeping America safe, we must, as Mr. Keenan suggests, apply our limited resources where they will do the most good. Where that exactly is, we have yet to determine. But we must be careful of basing our strategy on borders, when the enemy we are fighting is borderless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE STIMULUS LABEL MUST BE SHUNNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I was reading the Roll Call newspaper today, and on the front page it says, “New Economic Plan Weighed, But ‘Stimulus’ Label Shunned.” It says, “Democrats are scrambling to define a new plan to boost the economy as unemployment hurtles toward double digits, after months of insisting that talk of another stimulus package was premature.”

Just don’t call the as-yet-unwritten new proposal “stimulus.”

Shakespeare said a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. They’re talking about another stimulus bill. And everybody in this country knows that the \$787 billion stimulus, and with interest it’s over \$1 trillion, did not work.

The President said that unemployment would not go over 8 percent. It’s over 9.5 percent right now. And the Democrats are scared to death it’s going to go to 10 percent, so they are coming up with another plan, stimulus, to get the economy moving so there won’t be any more unemployment. It won’t work. It won’t work just taking government money and throwing it at the problem. It creates more deficits, it’s going to cause more inflation down the road, and it’s going to cost higher taxes, but it’s not going to create jobs.

The thing that creates jobs is giving Americans more disposable income in their paychecks. The thing that creates jobs is for businessmen and industry people to have more money so they can buy more equipment and more plants so they can produce more products that people can buy. And then the employees, because they have more money because their taxes have been lowered, can buy it. That’s what Ronald Reagan knew.

□ 2000

Ronald Reagan cut taxes when he came in. We were in a very bad economic time back in the early eighties. A lot of people don’t remember that, but they were very bad coming out of the Carter administration. So he came in and they said, You’ve got to raise taxes. You’ve got to throw money at it. And he said he thought we ought to do just the opposite. We ought to give people some of their money back by lowering taxes. We ought to give business and industry some of their money back so they can invest more, and that would create a rising tide that would raise all boats. And you know what? It did. And it created the longest period of economic expansion in the history of this country.

Now, today the President wants to solve the problem by taking taxpayers’ money, raising taxes, coming out with new programs that are spending billions of dollars and then throwing money at it. It will not work. If they come up with another stimulus package and they throw all of this money at it that we don’t have, we will have to print more and we will have inflation because of it, and that will raise taxes. Then the unemployment rate will continue to rise because people won’t have disposable income to spend. And many of them will be losing their jobs because businesspeople will be cutting back and laying people off or going offshore.

The fact of the matter is raising taxes right now, throwing more taxpayers’ money that we don’t have at the problem, will not solve it. The thing that will solve it, if I were talking to the President—and I hope maybe

someday he will be listening—is, Mr. President, cut taxes on the individual, cut taxes on business and industry. Give us more disposable income and people will buy products. And when they buy products, we will create products. And when we create products, we will create jobs. That is the answer. Ronald Reagan knew it, but President Obama doesn’t, but maybe he will get the message before long.

Where we are heading right now is toward a socialist economy, a government-run socialist economy like the Europeans are doing. It hasn’t worked there; it won’t work here.

Mr. Obama, Mr. President—if I were talking to him, I hope he will listen—cut taxes. Do what Ronald Reagan did and you will solve the problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SAY “YES” TO INTEGRITY IN THE NFL, “NO” TO RUSH LIMBAUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this is the value of democracy: differences of opinion. And, frankly, I believe that this government, this majority is on the right track. We were in an emergency, a recession that has continued for a period of months. Even as we watch Wall Street bounce back, we know the pain of Americans who have suffered the loss of jobs.

It is important to note that history is at our back; for if FDR had not been aggressive and taken risks to invest in programs that generated jobs, maybe not the type of focus of the 21st century but the WPA, who put our grandfathers and some grandmothers to work, allowed young men who were able to come back from World War II to be able to have an opportunity to then grow a capitalistic society, the boom of the 1950s, when those young men and young women married and created families and built homes.

And so it is important to have the facts. And I would say to you that the jobs data which we are collecting says that jobs have been created, important jobs. Thousands and thousands of teachers have been able to be retained to educate our children. We have had a number of others in various agencies that we have been able to keep, and those jobs then generate into the private sector.

I am often well aware that there are different economic perspectives, but Paul Krugman has a note, not necessarily the full article that I hope to associate myself with, but it says,

Pressure to scale back efforts to support the economy from those fearful of a sliding dollar should be ignored.

We are going to have to take risks. It is not a perfect system, but we are contemplating what will create more jobs. I believe it happens to be infrastructure and transportation, and we are looking at those issues. So know the facts. And we will have the facts because we are collecting data from all the States to be able to make the point that jobs have been created by this stimulus, and we know that we can do more.

Let me finally move to another topic and offer my thoughts, even though I believe in the First Amendment and the right to freedom of association, but I stand with the NFL Players Association, not to make Rush Limbaugh any kind of national standard or a national hero or the national issue. I will let my friends on the other side of the aisle determine what he is and what he is not, but I know that he is not the kind of owner that the NFL needs.

He does not represent the fullness of appreciation of athletes of all diverse backgrounds no matter what he wants to pretend to say on his radio station. But he is one who is divisive. Just as they are about to select him as a judge for a Miss America contest; I can't understand that, but that is their choice. Maybe they think he will bring in millions of listeners. But can you imagine a poor girl, scared already, to be able to ask a question about the person she admires most and she says somebody that happens to be a different political affiliation, she is, of course, not a winner. But that's their decision.

NFL has become one of America's pastimes. All of us from all walks of life and economic backgrounds look at the NFL. I know that there are far better owners that could be selected than one package that has this gentleman in it. I would ask the NFL owners to put standards in place, criteria; base it on integrity, not just the bottom buck. Anybody that wants to call a quarterback in Pennsylvania and call him out—he happens to be African American—as not being competent, just somebody that the media has promoted, not being talented—interestingly enough, that football player happens to still be playing and doing a great job. I don't know why in the heck, other than the big dollar, that Rush Limbaugh would be interested in the NFL. And so we're not interested in him either. And I would hope—though this is not my choice. This is not a government issue as well as it is an issue of integrity for those of us who believe that this is a great sport that brings all of us together.

I would hesitate to say that he is not someone who brings people together. And I just simply ask those owners to do the right thing; have a criteria of standards, a bottom line of integrity. It is not all about the dollar. It is about the value of sports and teamwork and working together and bring-

ing young people together and looking at values that are not political, that are simply about us getting along as a Nation, being admired by the world for having a great sporting community, if you will, whether it's baseball, basketball, football, soccer, tennis, golf. That's what it's about.

NFL owners, have some integrity. I think you need a different owner team.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, COMES TO WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, this week, a delegation of Monroe County elected officials, led by Mayor George Neugent, will be traveling here to Washington, D.C. In addition to meeting with Members of Congress, the Monroe County delegation will also meet with senior officials at FEMA on the issue of downstairs enclosures.

I have met with middle class homeowners in the Keys who are unable to secure flood insurance because of their downstairs enclosures. These homeowners utilize this additional living space to house an elderly resident, a family member, or to provide affordable housing to others. No one can afford to be without flood insurance in the Florida Keys. And since an inspection is required before any current flood insurance policy can be renewed, many residents are being left to fend for themselves.

While the issue of downstairs enclosures is certainly an important one, the state of our economy is the single most important issue for Keys residents. In recent months, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout the Keys to hear firsthand from teachers, from students, from entrepreneurs, retirees who are struggling because of uncertain economic conditions and a dwindling tourist economy. I have met with commercial fishermen in Key Largo who are abandoning their boats and leaving their lifetime passion in pursuit of part-time jobs that will at least pay the bills. Many of these fishermen are unable to make a living because of onerous fishing regulations and unfair moratoriums. I have met with small business owners in Key West who are closing down shop because of their inability to secure a bank loan which would at least carry them forward until next year.

The economic success of our community rests on the success of our fishermen and our hotel owners as well as on the environmental preservation of our

beaches, our coral reefs, and other precious ecosystems. As a Member of Congress who proudly represents the Florida Keys, I have consistently fought for increased Federal action to protect our environment. For example, our Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary is a world-renowned institution, and we have beautiful coral reefs that are a major economic engine for our local economy.

Last month, the House of Representatives passed the Coral Reef Conservation Act, a bill that I cosponsored. This bill increases Federal oversight of coral reef monitoring and rehabilitation efforts as well as promoting community-based conservation initiatives.

In addition to conservation efforts, I am working with my colleagues here in Congress to support the Aquarius Underwater Sea Lab, which is based in Key Largo. Aquarius is the only permanent underwater lab in the world, and its facilities are used in partnership with NASA and the Navy to train astronauts, divers, and to develop cutting-edge technology. I have been in contact with officials at NOAA to voice my strong support for the continuation of this important program, Aquarius, which is of great benefit to the scientific community and to our local economy.

During this time of economic uncertainty and volatile gas prices, it is more important now than ever that we reduce our dependency on foreign oil. The foundation of a comprehensive energy policy depends upon our ability to develop alternative sources of energy.

In Congress, I have been a consistent advocate of green energy initiatives. I voted to raise national fuel economy standards for our automobiles and establish a Federal renewable electricity standard. I have also voted to increase tax incentives for small businesses that utilize energy-efficient technologies in the workplace, such as solar panels or hybrid cars.

The Florida Keys has the potential of becoming a major market for green tourism, both nationally and internationally. And of course in order to achieve this goal we need to improve both our transportation infrastructure as well as our wastewater infrastructure.

I am proud to say that I have been a leader in securing millions in Federal dollars for our roadways, our bus facilities, as well as for the Florida Keys Wastewater Project. Securing Federal funds for the Florida Keys Wastewater Project is a top priority of mine in Congress because we have to protect our National Marine Sanctuary from further environmental damage. In the past year, I have secured more than \$25 million toward this project.

Later this week, the House of Representatives will vote on a Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which includes funding for a new emergency operation center which will serve all of Monroe County. I know that the need for Federal dollars is great, and I will